

Remarks

Claims 18, 26, 27, and 40 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 12 to 17, 19 to 25, and 28 to 39 have been amended. New claim 41 has been added. Claims 1, 12 to 17, 19 to 25, and 28 to 39, and 41 remain pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1 to 6 due to informalities in claim 1. Applicants assume the Examiner intended this to be claims 1 to 5 as claim was not originally presented and the renumbered claim 6 has been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 13 has amended to more clearly define the connection between the second and third walls.

Claims 7 to 41 have been renumbered 6 to 40, as required by the Examiner. Dependencies within these claims have also been amended to reflect the renumbering.

Applicants submit that the formal objections have been overcome and request the withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 5 and 12 to 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Takeo et al., Japanese Patent No. 10-274359 in view of Meyerhoefer, U.S. Patent 6,044,194. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites in part a cable clip with a cable segregator comprising an outer housing including a first end, a second end and a side defining an open sided space. The outer housing includes grooves along the outer portions of the ends and the side for receiving the edges of a mounting opening. Two of the grooves along the top and bottom of the outer housing each include a recess for receiving a tab formed in each of the first and second edges of the mounting opening.

Takeo, as the Examiner noted, does not teach or suggest that the clip include grooves around three outer edges for receiving edges of a mounting opening. In fact, Takeo teaches away from such a construction as the gate of Takeo would be fixed in a

closed position and not be functional if the clip of Takeo were mounted as recited in claim 1. Indeed, as shown in Takeo, it is not clear how the clip of Takeo could be mounted to any surface or opening. No item or element of the drawings appears to be a mounting appendage. There is nothing to suggest that the clip of Takeo could be mounted to an opening in a wall. Meyerhoefer does not teach or suggest that the grooves along the top and bottom of the clip include recesses for receiving tabs in the edges of the mounting opening. In fact, Meyerhoefer teaches away from the need for such recesses and tabs in that the shape of the mounting opening has a wide portion where the clip is mounted and a narrow portion which would prohibit the removal of the clip.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the cited prior art does not render claim 1 obvious and that claim 1 is in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 to 5 depend from and further limit claim 1. Claim 2 recites in part that the depth of the slots is sized to receive two cables. Takeo only teaches and suggests that the cable slots be deep enough to hold a single cable and teaches a member design which locks together within the insertion of a single cable in FIGS. 3 a and b. Claim 3 recites in part that each slot have a nominal width opening and a plurality of wider than nominal portions along the depth of the slot. Takeo only teaches or suggests a single portion along the depth of the slot which is wider than the opening at the top of the slot. Claim 5 recites in part that a gate extend across the open end of the slots. As noted above, Takeo teaches and suggests a gate which is not physically able to move between open and closed positions with the mounting groove configuration recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons and those reasons cited above with regard to claim 1, Applicants submit that claims 2 to 5 are not rendered obvious by the cited prior art and that claims 2 to 5 are in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claim 12 as amended, recites in part a cable riser including a plurality of mounting openings along a first edge of a first wall and a plurality of cable clips mounted within the mounting openings. Each of these cable clips mounted within the mounting openings include outer housing including a first end, a second end and a side defining an open sided space. The outer housing includes grooves along the outer portions of the

ends and the side for receiving the edges of a mounting opening. Two of the grooves along the top and bottom of the outer housing each include a recess for receiving a tab formed in each of the first and second edges of the mounting opening.

Takeo, as the Examiner noted, does not teach or suggest that the clip include grooves around three outer edges for receiving edges of a mounting opening. In fact, Takeo teaches away from such a construction as the gate of Takeo would be fixed in a closed position and not be functional if the clip of Takeo were mounted as recited in claim 12. Indeed, as shown in Takeo, it is not clear how the clip of Takeo could be mounted to any surface or opening. No item or element of the drawings appears to be a mounting appendage. There is nothing to suggest that the clip of Takeo could be mounted to an opening in a wall. Meyerhoefer does not teach or suggest that the grooves along the top and bottom of the clip include recesses for receiving tabs in the edges of the mounting opening. In fact, Meyerhoefer teaches away from the need for such recesses and tabs in that the shape of the mounting opening has a wide portion where the clip is mounted and a narrow portion which would prohibit the removal of the clip.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 12 is not rendered obvious by the cited prior art and that claim 12 is in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 to 17 depend from and further limit claim 12. Claim 14 recites in part that the depth of the slots is sized to receive two cables. Takeo only teaches or suggests that a single cable be held in each slot. Claim 15 recites in part that each slot have a nominal width opening and a plurality of wider than nominal portions along the depth of the slot. Takeo only teaches or suggests a single portion along the depth of the slot which is wider than the opening at the top of the slot. Claim 17 recites in part that a gate extend across the open end of the slots. As noted above, Takeo teaches and suggests a gate which is not physically able to move between open and closed positions with the mounting groove configuration recited in claim 12.

For at least these reasons and those reasons cited above with regard to claim 12, Applicants submit that claims 13 to 17 are not rendered obvious by the cited prior art and that claims 13 to 17 are in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claim 19 recites in part that a cable riser includes first, second and third walls cooperating to define a channel, with the front edge of the first wall having mounting openings for mounting cable clips with segregators. Cable routing clips are mounted to the first sides of each of the first, second and third walls and the cable routing clips cooperate to define a plurality of cable paths within the riser.

As the Examiner notes, Takeo does not teach or suggest that the clip of Takeo be mounted to a wall of a cable riser. While Meyerhoefer does teach a riser, there is no teaching or suggestion that the inner surfaces of the walls of the riser include cable routing clips defining a plurality of cable paths within the riser. With the layout of mounting openings along side walls 6 and 8, there is no space for the mounting of such cable routing clips. No clips are shown mounted to base 4 and the mounting of clips to base 4 is neither taught nor suggested.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 19 is not anticipated by the cited prior art and that claim 19 is in condition for immediate allowance.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claim 20 depends from and further limits claim 19. For at least those reasons cited above with regard to claim 19, Applicants submit that claim 20 is not anticipated by the cited prior art and that claim 20 is in condition for immediate allowance.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claim 21 recites in part a method of loading cables into a plurality of cable paths defined within a channel of a cable riser. Neither of the cited references teach or suggest the definition of multiple cable paths within a cable riser and thus neither can teach or suggest the method of loading cables recited in claim 21. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 21 is not anticipated by the cited prior art and that claim 21 is in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 22 depends from and further limits claim 21. For at least those reasons cited above with regard to claim 21, Applicants submit that claim 22 is not anticipated by the cited prior art and is in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 recites in part a cable clip comprising an outer housing including a first end, a second end and a side defining an open sided space. The outer housing includes grooves along the outer portions of the ends and the side for receiving the edges of a mounting opening. Two of the grooves along the top and bottom of the outer housing each include a recess for receiving a tab formed in each of the first and second edges of the mounting opening. A gate is hingedly mounted to the first end and releasably engages a catch on the second end to covering the open sided space.

Takeo, as the Examiner noted, does not teach or suggest that the clip include grooves around three outer edges for receiving edges of a mounting opening. In fact, Takeo teaches away from such a construction as the gate of Takeo would be fixed in a closed position and not be functional if the clip of Takeo were mounted as recited in claim 23. Indeed, as shown in Takeo, it is not clear how the clip of Takeo could be mounted to any surface or opening. No item or element of the drawings appears to be a mounting appendage. There is nothing to suggest that the clip of Takeo could be mounted to an opening in a wall. Meyerhoefer does not teach or suggest that the grooves along the top and bottom of the clip include recesses for receiving tabs in the edges of the mounting opening. In fact, Meyerhoefer teaches away from the need for such recesses and tabs in that the shape of the mounting opening has a wide portion where the clip is mounted and a narrow portion which would prohibit the removal of the clip.

Claims 24 and 25 depend from and further limit claim 23. For at least the reasons cited above with regard to claim 23, Applicants submit that claims 23 and 24 are not anticipated by the cited prior art and are in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 28 recites in part a cable riser with first, second and third walls defining a channel. A plurality of cable clips are mounted to front edge of the first wall in mounting openings. The mounting openings have tabs extending into the opening from top and bottom and the tabs on the top and bottom are different sizes. The cable clips include openings in a top and a bottom to receive the tabs.

Takeo does not show a cable riser or teach or suggest that the clip of Takeo might be mounted within an opening in a wall of a riser. The clip of Takeo is not compatible with mounting within an opening such as that recited in claim 28. The gate would be

inoperable if mounted within a three-sided opening and cables could not be placed within the clip. Meyerhoefer does not teach or suggest that the top and bottom of the mounting opening include tabs extending from the top and the bottom which are received within the top and bottom of the cable clip. Meyerhoefer teaches away from such a construction since the narrower opening 16 prevent clip 20 from moving out wider slot 14. Clip 20 fits entirely within slot 14 and no portion of the edges of 16 are taught or suggested to be received within openings in the top and bottom of clip 20.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 28 is not anticipated by the cited prior art and that claim 28 is in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 29 to 33 depend from and further limit claim 28. Claim 29 recites in part that the riser defines a generally vertical cable channel with a narrower bottom than top. Meyerhoefer does not teach or suggest that riser be narrower at the top or the bottom. FIG. 2 appears to show that the side walls 6 and 8 are vertical, without any taper. FIG. 1 does not show that base 4 tapered toward the top or the bottom. Claim 30 recites in part that a gate is hingedly connected to a first end and releasably engages a catch on a second end of the cable clip. As discussed above the only gate taught or suggested by the cited references is that of Takeo and this gate is not compatible with the mounting arrangement of the clip within a three-sided mounting opening are recited in claim 30. Claim 32 recites in part that a plurality of cable routing clips are mounted within the channel and define a plurality of generally vertical cable paths within the channel. Neither of the cited references teaches or suggests that the cable riser include cable routing clips defining a plurality of cable paths within the riser.

For at least these reasons and those cited above with regard to claim 28, Applicants submit that claims 29 to 33 are not anticipated by the cited prior art and are in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 34 recites in part a cable riser with first, second and third walls defining a channel and a plurality of mounting openings to receive cable clips in the front edge of the first wall. The mounting openings include a top edge and a bottom edge, each

including a tab extending partially into the mounting opening, with the top and bottom tabs of different size to orient a cable clip within the opening.

As noted above, Takeo does not teach or suggest a cable riser or the nature of a mounting opening into which the clip of Takeo might be mounted. Meyerhoefer does not teach or suggest that the mounting opening 14 include any tabs extending into the mounting opening and teaches away from such tabs due to narrower slot 16 positioned adjacent slot 14, as noted above. In addition, Meyerhoefer does not teach or suggest a need to have clip oriented in any particular manner within slot 14.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 34 is not anticipated by the cited prior art and that claim 34 is in condition for immediate allowance.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claim 35 recites in part a cable clip with an outer housing including a first end, a second end and a side defining an open sided space. A plurality of open ended cable slots are formed within the open space by a plurality of members extending from the side. The outer housing includes grooves along the outer portions of the ends and the side for receiving the edges of a mounting opening. Two of the grooves along the top and bottom of the outer housing each include a recess for receiving a tab formed in each of the first and second edges of the mounting opening.

Takeo, as the Examiner noted, does not teach or suggest that the clip include grooves around three outer edges for receiving edges of a mounting opening. In fact, Takeo teaches away from such a construction as the gate of Takeo would be fixed in a closed position and not be functional if the clip of Takeo were mounted as recited in claim 35. Indeed, as shown in Takeo, it is not clear how the clip of Takeo could be mounted to any surface or opening. No item or element of the drawings appears to be a mounting appendage. There is nothing to suggest that the clip of Takeo could be mounted to an opening in a wall. Meyerhoefer does not teach or suggest that the grooves along the top and bottom of the clip include recesses for receiving tabs in the edges of the mounting opening. In fact, Meyerhoefer teaches away from the need for such recesses and tabs in that the shape of the mounting opening has a wide portion where the clip is mounted and a narrow portion which would prohibit the removal of the clip.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 35 is not anticipated by the cited prior art and that claim 35 is in condition for immediate allowance.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 36 to 39 depend from and further limit claim 35. Claim 36 recites in part that the cable slots be sized to receive two cables. Takeo only teaches and suggests that the cable slots be deep enough to hold a single cable and teaches a member design which locks together within the insertion of a single cable in FIGS. 3 a and b. Claim 37 recites in part that each slot have a nominal width opening and a plurality of wider than nominal portions along the depth of the slot. Takeo only teaches or suggests a single portion along the depth of the slot which is wider than the opening at the top of the slot. Claim 39 recites in part that a gate is hingedly mounted to the first end, releasably engages a catch on the second end in a closed position and covers the open end of the cable slots. As noted above, Takeo teaches and suggests a gate which is not physically able to move between open and closed positions with the mounting groove configuration recited in claim 35.

For at least these reasons and those recited above with regard to claim 35, Applicants submit that claims 36 to 39 are not anticipated by the cited prior art and are in condition for immediate allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

New claim 41 recites in part a cable riser with first, second and third walls defining a channel. A plurality of cable clips are mounted to front edge of the first wall in mounting openings. The mounting openings have a top edge, a bottom edge and a side edge. These edges are received within grooves formed along an outer portion of a top, a bottom and a side of the cable clip. A gate is hingedly connected to a first end and releasably engages a catch on a second end of the cable clip. A plurality of cable routing clips are mounted within the channel and define a plurality of generally vertical cable paths within the channel.

As noted above, the gate of Takeo is incompatible with the mounting of the clip within the mounting opening on the front edge of the first wall as recited in claim 41 and no other mounting arrangement is taught or suggested by Takeo. Neither of the cited


references teach or suggest that a cable riser include a plurality of cable routing clips defining a plurality of cable paths within the channel.

Applicants submit that claim 41 is patentable over the cited prior art.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment and Response, or feels that a telephone interview will aid the examination of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative Alan Stewart at 612.371.5376.\

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: September 17, 2003

By: 
Name: Alan R. Stewart
Reg. No.: 47,974
ARS:pil

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 22 2003

OFFICIAL